Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
NOV 2 1970
E. ROBERT SEAVER, CLERK

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

OCTOBER TERM, 1970

NO. 772

JOHN E. ALDRIDGE
and
MARVIN WOOTEN,

Petitioners

-versus-

GROZELIA CARR, FANNIE MOORE, VERA WALKER, CODA M. FEARS, MARY LESSIE EWING and ESTER STEGALL, Individually and on Behalf of All Other Persons Similarly Situated,

Respondents.

MOTION TO DISPENSE WITH PRINTING BRIEF IN OPPOSITION TO PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Now comes respondent in the above-entitled cause, by their attorney, JAMES ROBERTSON, and move to dispense with printing of the brief in opposition to the Petition for a Writ of Certiorari.

In support of this motion, counsel states:

1) Respondents are Negro residents of Aberdeen, Mississippi who brought a class action against the petitioners, as officers of Mississippi Employment Security Commission (hereinafter MESC), and a corporate defendant, Monroe Manufacturing Company (now Conoco Plastics, Inc.) alleging violations of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of

1964 by the Aberdeen office of MESC. Respondents charged that in handling job applications, in making referrals for job placment at the defendant company, and in classifying Negroes for placement at the defendant company, the MESC discriminated against Negroes. Respondents sought to obtain copies of work application cards in the possession of MESC, and petitioners moved for permission to block out identifying names and addresses on such cards. The United States District Court for the Northern District of Mississippi denied petitioners' motion, and the Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit affirmed the decision of the District Court. Petitioners have brought on the within Petition to reveiw the decisions below.

2) On information and belief, respondents have no funds with which to pay their attorneys for their services in the within matter. Respondents are all poor people. The payment of the costs of printing this brief would either be impossible or would be a great and undue hardship upon them.

3) Counsel for respondents are authorized to represent to the Court that petitioners have no objection to the granting of this motion.

WHEREFORE, respondents pray that an order be entered dispensing with the printing of the brief in opposition to the Petition for a Writ of Certiorari in this case.

JAMES ROBERTSON
Attorney for Respondents
Grozelia Carr, et al.
Lawyers' Committee for Civil
Rights Under Law
1660 L Street, N.W. Suite 1001
Washington, D.C. 20036

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I have this day served three copies of the foregoing Motion to Dispense with Printing Brief in Opposition to Petition for Writ of Certiorari to the Supreme Court of the United States by mailing the second day of November, 1970, to:

Honorable Albioun F. Summer
Attorney of Record for Defendants-Appellants
Post Office Box 220
Jackson, Mississippi

Honorable H. L. Hutcherson
Attorney for Defendants-Appellants
Post Office Box 1699
Jackson, Mississippi

Honorable Walter R. Bivins
Attorney for Defendants-Appellants
Post Office Box 1699
Jackson, Mississippi

James Robertson